

United States Patent and Trademark Office

M

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/624,996	07/22/2003	Thomas M. Risch	LMI-002	8183
36822 75	590 08/05/2004		EXAM	INER
GORDON & JACOBSON, P.C.			MAUST, TIMOTHY LEWIS	
65 WOODS EN STAMFORD,			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			3751	
•			DATE MAILED: 08/05/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		$\langle \Lambda \Lambda \Lambda \rangle$			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/624,996	RISCH ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Timothy L Maust	3751			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply y within the statutory minimum of thirty (3 will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH	be timely filed (0) days will be considered timely. S from the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on $\underline{22 J}$					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 1	1, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraws 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1,2,4,6,7 and 12-32 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 3,5 and 8-11 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	wn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 July 2003 is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11.	☑ accepted or b)☐ objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance tion is required if the drawing(s)	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in App rity documents have been re u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	olication No eceived in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/22/03.	Paper No(s)/I	nmary (PTO-413) Mail Date rmal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 3751

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7 and 12-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cunningham.

In regard to claims 1, 2, 12-16 and 19, the Cunningham reference discloses a "container" 10 having an "opening" (defined at the point of entry of stem 15), a "fill valve" 20 including an "upper split portion" 27 defining two relatively "flat bills" 31, a "barb" 28, a "lower annular flange" (opposite end of split 27), an "annular groove" (just above annular flange discussed supra), a "cap" 9 (absent further structure), an actuatable "valve" (15 and 19), as claimed.

In regard to claims 4, 6, 7, 17 and 18, see "separating element" (defined by rubber seal 16 in Figure 2).

Art Unit: 3751

Claims 15 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Scheindel.

In regard to claim 15, 20, the Scheindel reference discloses a refillable and repressurizable "container" having an "open end", a "cap" and an actuatable outlet "valve" (typical pressurized container; see col. 1) a "surface" 20 with a "hole" 18 having an "edge" 19, a resilient fill "valve" 10 defining an "interior space" 22 having a "head portion" 12, a reduced diameter "neck" 16 and a "flared opening portion" 14 at least one "separating element" 22, a "needle" 34, a "pressurization station" (see col. 3, lines 12-54), as claimed.

In regard to claims 21 and 22, the "base" 28 is larger than the tapered "neck" (26a-b).

Claims 26 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Demarest et al.

In regard to claims 26 and 30, the Demarest et al. reference discloses a "pressurizing system" comprising a "pressurization station" 10 including a "compressor" 12, a "needle" 20, an "upstanding collar" 18 and "beveled surface" 16, a "pressurizable container" 14 having a actuatable "valve" 22 and a lower end provided with a "fill valve" 24, as claimed.

Art Unit: 3751

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scheindel.

The Scheindel reference discloses the invention substantially as claimed (discussed supra). It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to make the needle head of the Scheindel device into a frustoconical shape, since applicant has not disclosed that a frustoconical shape rather than a tapered shape solves any stated problem and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with a tapered.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scheindel in view of Demarest et al.

The Scheindel reference discloses the invention substantially as claimed (discussed supra), but does not disclose the specifics of the pressurization station having an upstanding collar surrounding the needle. However, the Demarest et al. reference (discussed supra) discloses a pressurization station having an upstanding collar surrounding the needle to guide and support a container to be refilled. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a pressurization station having an upstanding collar

Art Unit: 3751

surrounding the needle (if not already) as, for example, taught by the Demarest et al. reference to guide and support a container to be refilled.

Claims 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Demarest et al. in view of Cunningham.

The Demarest et al. reference discloses the invention (discussed supra) substantially as claimed including the valve 24 being a pressure activated valve, but does not disclose the valve being a slit or duck bill valve. The Cunningham reference (discussed supra) discloses a refillable container having a slit valve 20 for pressure filling the container. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute the slit valve for the umbrella valve on the Demarest et al. device as, for example, taught by Cunningham wherein so doing would amount to mere substitution of one functional equivalent valve for another within the same art and the selection of any of these valves would work equally well in the Demarest et al. device.

Claims 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Demarest et al.

The Demarest et al. reference discloses the invention (discussed supra) substantially as claimed, but does not explicitly disclose the clearance dimension of the container with the collar. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the clearance dimensions between the container and collar as claimed, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result

Art Unit: 3751

effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617F 2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3, 5 and 8-11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The H.D. Bartels and Mietz references pertain to various refillable containers having refill valves, similar to Applicant's device.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Timothy L Maust whose telephone number is (703) 308-3390. The examiner can normally be reached on Tue. - Fri. 6:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Huson can be reached on (703) 308-2580. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3751

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Timothy L Maust Primary Examiner Art Unit 3751

Tlm 8/3/04